DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 211 HE 000 225

By Clark, Burton R.

The Character of Colleges: Some Case Studies.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Pub Date Jun 65

Note-31p.; Paper prepared for Conference on Dynamics of Change in the Modern University, Syracuse, New York, June 13-17, 1965.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.65

Descriptors-*Colleges, *College Students, Educational Administration, *Educational Environment, Educational Objectives, Educational Policy, Environmental Influences, *Faculty, *Higher Education, Institutional Environment

The distinctive quality of a college is not readily discernible and its identification requires long-term, intensive study. Some common features that help to analyze the character of an institution were discovered in a study of historical developments which occurred during a 40 to 50-year period at 3 colleges (Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore). College curricula usually incorporate the educational aims of a college and shed light on what the academic commitments of the institution are. Varying degrees of authority distributed between trustees, faculty, administrators, and sometimes students, may determine what values will be supported and what programs are eventually developed and instituted as part of the formal structure. Faculty members' belief in the college and their ability to defend and sustain its values link them with the institution's history and self-image. The variety of student interests, personalities, educational and occupational plans, and roles strongly influence campus orientation. Outside the campus, how a college is regarded - and by whom - helps determine the public image component of its character. Institutional viability is positively affected by linkages with certain constituencies that have students from particular social strata, and the nature of relations between the institution and financial donors, including the Federal Government. Guidelines for conducting an organizational analysis of any particular institution are included. (WM)

THE CHARACTER OF COLLEGES: SOME CASE STUDIES

Burton R. Clark

Research Sociologist, Center for the Study of Higher Education, and Professor of Education, University of California, Berkeley.

ED025211

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED025211

HE000 225

Paper prepared for Conference on Dynamics of Change in the Modern University, Syracuse University, June 13-17, 1965.

When we seek the dynamics of change in a college or university, it helps to know what elements of the organization are critical to its nature. The important features, linked together in some fashion, constitute the character of the organization. As in individuals, the character of an organization may be tightly or loosely integrated, distinct or indistinct. Difficult to discern and describe in most cases, we commonly speak of it as intangible. Yet even when character is quite indistinct, we can put our finger on it to some degree. Participants in one organization after another feel their place has a special flavor or style and tell us a little about it. Outsiders who relate closely to an organization often sense that it is, at root, agressive or passive, experimental or hopelessly wedded to the status quo. The impressions of insiders and outsiders exaggerate and simplify, but usually around a core of truth. There are organizational commitments and avoidances, habits and blind spots, competencies and incompetencies that allow us to predict what the organization will want to do, what it can and cannot do well, and how it will respond to different challenges and pressures.

Our capacity in social research to identify the character of organizations has not proceeded much past the conventional wisdom. There are at present no methodological short-cuts, no quick and easy ways of obtaining the requisite information and insight. This is especially true for colleges and universities; for reasons later discussed, they are

unusually complex. A questionnaire mailed out to colleges from a national office only begins to scratch the surface. To attempt to appraise the character of colleges is to create a need for prolonged and intensive probing, a style roughly analogous to the slow case-by-case effort that clinicians use in seeking to understand the character of individuals. The organizational analyst, at a minimum, must go to the campus and roam around, observing what students, faculty, and administrators do in their regular locales of classroom, office, committee room, coffee shop, dormitory, and, in some places, the faculty home. He needs to converse as well as to interview. He needs to read old records as well as to write a questionnaire, to sit with the campus historian as well as the student who is currently in passage.

In order to suggest ways of looking at the character of colleges, I will turn first to three cases drawn from my own research.[1] The colleges are Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore. For each of these institutions, I will try to summarize developments over a period of forty to fifty years. I will then draw components of character from these cases and offer a rudimentary list that may sensitize us to possibilities in other colleges and universities. This will lead to a concluding statement on how a person might go about investigating the character of a college.

THREE CASES

ANTIOCH

If we wish to understand the Antioch of today, it helps considerably to turn to the revolutionary change that occurred there in the 1920s.

Up to that time (1863-1920), the College had been church-related, locally-based in student body and control, impoverished, provincial, and obscure. In a crisis of impending bankruptcy in 1919, the College was put in the hands of Arthur E. Morgan, an eminent water conservation engineer, who had long dreamed of a radical break from current practice in American higher education. Morgan combined a utopian vision with considerable personal force and magnetism. His educational philosophy centered on the "whole man" and he sought a balanced approach that would bring together the practical and the intellectual. Morgan wanted a college in which students would gain a general education, one appropriate to leadership in business and the community, by working and participating in a community as well as by studying in the classroom.

The new President moved rapidly on a number of fronts to make the College an instrument of his ideals. He immediately changed the curriculum to an alternation of study and work, a complex scheme that was modified many times before it settled down to a permanent form. In a position, unusual among college presidents, to shape the Board of Trustees, he turned in local ministers for nationally known industrialists and bankers. The financial base of the College was quickly expanded many fold. The president was also able to shape the student body and moved rapidly into the national recruitment pool as he replaced the small group of local boys and girls with a much larger group drawn from afar. He was in a position to shape the faculty, and was able to recruit

professors of the kind necessary to the venture he had in mind--sometimes general educationalists of an extreme sort, as in the case of an Indian philosopher-engineer who taught sociology, and a man whose career at the College was to include teaching in business, teaching in English, and teaching in the dean of students office. In the late 1920s, the College began to experiment with the forms of student participation in a campus polity that evolved into the College's vaunted Community Government. This Government became the backbone of the Antioch conception of campus as community. Morgan was also an effective propagandist, an image-maker, and he stormed the country with newsletters, magazine articles, newspaper accounts, and speeches. He got national figures to give their prestige as "Friends of Antioch"; to have Harvard's President Emeritus Eliot and a rising young politician named Franklin Delano Roosevelt lending their name to the cause was to move rapidly from obscurity to national note. A strong public image of Antioch developed within a decade, an image of a liberal, experimental college with a unique curriculum. The outside impression was critical to a steady stream of appropriate students and faculty. Change went forward on many fronts simultaneously and rapidly, under conditions favorable to change.

Arthur Morgan left the College in the early 1930s and there was significant evolution after his time. But many of the ideals and practices instituted in the twenties to form a new character were carried forward and much of the later evolution was a working-out of the new

programs. What were the carrying mechanisms of the second Antioch? The new character was embodied in many aspects of the campus. It was first of all represented in the curriculum, notably in the work-study scheme but also in sequences of courses, levels of achievement, tests, and papers that were addressed to a particular version of general education. A scheme of work, a curriculum, has some momentum of its own; it becomes a prime carrier, moreover, when the faculty believes in it. The faculty, by official section, self-selection, and on-campus acculturation became wedded to a particular institutional self-image, one in which the work-study plan and Community Government were specific and salient elements. Their conception of the institution would not, in turn, have been critical if they were powerless. But authority flowed into their hands after Morgan left and their ideals were given a firm power base. Men who were True Believers had the power to protect practices that increasingly took on a certain scared quality. In short, the values and the authority of the members of the faculty worked together to help institutionalize salient components of transformed character.

The public reputation of the College also snowballed along the tracks established in the 1920s -- the tracks of educational progressivism and politically activism -- as many who were liberal learned to admire the College and as many who were conservative learned to despise it. The outside impressions became strongly fixed, a matter of engrained sentiment, in many schools, neighborhoods, and social strata. Public image became a prime carrier of institutional character. With

the imagery went a social base that continued to build in the directions set in the 1920s. The base shifted increasingly toward Big City upper middle class liberals, those who read The Nation, got psychoanalyzed, and sought progressive schools for their children. Antioch could usually get as many students as it wanted from New York City; but Ohio was constantly undersubscribed. The small base Antioch developed in its home state was mutually exclusive with the much larger one of the late Senator Bricker.

In a brief review we can only mention some of the subtle aspects of the character of a college. At Antioch, (to describe it inadequately) there is a subtle blend of a "soft" pacifist, almost rural, morality with a "hard" Big City liberality. Arthur Morgan was a rural man, with rural ideals of reforming society through the leadership of small-town business-men. The self-recruitment to the College and the evolution of the work plan diverted the institution away from the small town, however, to the big city. The Morgan ideals of community, to the extent they were expressed in faculty personal philosophies, found their support particularly in Unitarianism, and Quakerism, a religious spirit that in turn created an opening to the Left, politically, a tolerance for the militant, non-religious reformers who flowed to Antioch to pick up the picket-sign. The Unitarian-Quaker outlook reached its peak of development at the College in the 1930s; it has continued to be an important part of the morality of the place, an "intangible" easily missed by the a-historical observer, especially the one who sends a questionnaire to observe for him. It is a backdrop to the militant political activists

who have come on strong since 1945 and whose demonstrations capture public attention.

Looking backward to the transformation of the 1920s and the tools of embodiment and protection constructed in the 1920s and 1930s helps us comprehend the Antioch of post-World War II and the problems it faces. The historical analysis tells us what is relatively old and new in present-day character; it helps illumine what is hard-core belief and what is tactical face-work, in the arguments of Old Staff and Young Turks; it points to what is internal inclination and what is adaptation to modern society, in the determinants of action and change.

REED

Reed is a case study in the preservation of initial commitment. The College took off on the academic high road in 1911 and clung there, more than once by the fingertips, when lack of money and adverse public reaction threatened to push the College over the edge and down the mountainside. Those who wish to know about stubbornness in college should study Reed. It has been an unaccommodating institution.

Encouraged by the General Education Board, Reed's first board of trustees decided that what the City of Portland, the State of Oregon, and the Pacific Northwest needed above all in education was a strong, pace-setting liberal arts college. The first President, William T. Foster, was sternly unhappy with the academic flabbiness of American colleges, including his alma mater, Harvard. He set to work to fashion

"a John Hopkins for undergraduates, the Balliol of America." He and his successors did indeed fashion an all-honors college, with no hiding place for the student, gentleman or otherwise, who might be in search of an easy "C". There were to be no rah-rah intercollegiate sports; no social life that would undermine the classroom, hence no sororities and fraternities; no admission of weak and marginal students "on condition" -- then a common practice in even the best of places. Instead there would be a series of major hurdles for all that would insure persistent and serious study: stiff admissions scrutiny; freshmen courses that included seminar-type discussion of the great literature; an examination -- "the Junior Qual" -- to qualify for passage from the junior to the senior year; a thesis in the senior year, an oral examination on the thesis. Relative to other places, there was no escaping the academic travail.

The strictly academic tone of the curriculum and the extracurricular activities became rapidly institutionalized. It was doctrine by the end of the first decade that the student body did not pay attention to the frivolities of college life. Attempts to develop intercollegiate sports, for example, were beaten back by the faculty and students several times. In so doing, the defenders claimed they were being consistent with Reed ideals and tradition and thereby protecting the integrity of the institution.

The College was also inclined from the beginning to be liberal and critical of established institutions. The first President and his associates were high-minded reformers, straight out of New England, eager to cleanse Portland of its sins. They went after the motion picture

houses and other dens of iniquity. Some among them, including the President, were outspoken pacifists during World War I. Some were impatient political liberals, including the young sociologist William Ogburn and a young Paul Douglas in economics, reading the new New Republic and beginning a career that would lead to the United States Senate. The values of the faculty were, in short, sharply academic and militantly liberal.

It did not take long for such an institution to create a distinct image that would affect relations with the outside world. By the end of the first decade, local citizens had marked the place as radical and unsound. The public impressions had a snowballing, self-confirming tendency. Liberal professors and students were increasingly attracted to it. Conservative professors and students and donors were increasingly repelled, or more deeply confirmed in their beliefs about the place. Political myths about the College that waxed at one time and have never to this day been laid to rest completely confuse William T. Foster, the first President, with William Z. Foster, the American Communist leader, and Simeon Reed, entrepreneur and benefactor, with John Reed who lies buried in the Kremlin. As a result, local money dried up and the College took up residence among the poor. What is different about Reed's history from other poverty-stricken colleges is that the College broke the correlation of poorness and mediocrity. The several dozen men who were the senior faculty of the 1920s and 1930s held stubbornly to the ideals established in the first fifteen years, instead of making the compromises that would have allowed them to buy shoes for their babes.

Critical to that stubbornness was the power of the faculty. The College moved toward strong faculty government as early as 1915, upon the heels of a major scandal in academic freedom at the University of Utah; and upon the death of the College's second president in 1924, Reed became a case of extreme faculty control. The heavy amount of faculty influence on policy protected the Reed style, against more than one President who sought change, and against the Board and the community when they grew unusually restless about the direction and tone of campus life. With this, administrative strain became a way of life, one out of which the College has begun to work itself in the last six to eight years. As recently as 1954, however, faculty protection of colleagues under political attack from the outside led to a major breach in relations with trustees and the community. Reed presidents rapidly become experts on town-gown relations.

The College's recruitment pool also gradually changed over time from local to national, as its reputation grew. Reed's students came from Portland and the Pacific Northwest in the early years and the College achieved considerable national prominence without national recruitment. After World War II, students from California and the East increasingly formed the majority. The liberal components of the Reed reputation caused some self-selection by liberal students, as a non-conformist component developed in the reputation, there has been some self-selection by non-conformists. The input characteristics of the students have sped the student culture in its evolution toward a distinctive style of liberal, intellectual non-conformity. The romantic images of the students closed

in the 1950s around the activities and appearances of a strident minority who symbolized their detachment and criticism with beards and barefeet -- and barefeet on the cold sidewalks of Portland in February is a great deal of symbolism.

I have said enough about Reed to suggest some of the features that have been critical in the forming of its character and the carrying-on of that character from one decade to another. As at Antioch, character was built into a distinctive curriculum and into the way the extra-curricular domain of activities was related to the curricular. The faculty became deeply attached to certain ideals and practices; it also became powerful; and that power became a sustaining element. Public image mediated relations with the environment, repelling certain resources and attracting others, and in the process helping to form a social base in a national strata of families that are upper middle class, liberal, and culturally-sophisticated. Student traditions formed around a combination of stern study, avoidance of ordinary social life of college students, freedom in personal life outside the classroom, and nonconformity.

SWARTHMORE

One reason why Swarthmore stands so high among American colleges is that it got around to study ahead of time. Colleges in which study is the major sport were not numerous in the nineteen twenties. Colleges were still drawing largely from a local population in which family ties often loomed large; the spirit of the times was kind to the good life

in college, for graduate school deans and corporation recruiters were not yet a major force on the undergraduate campus. The elective system was in control, reducing the pressures of the curriculum to the option of the student.

There were always some reforming educators around, however, to worry about the state of educational affairs and attempt to spoil the fun. Among these reformers was Frank Aydelotte, a former Rhodes Scholar, who had Oxbridge firmly in his mind when he assumed the presidency of Swarthmore in 1920. The College had until then led a sheltered if not always quiet life, from the time the Hicksite or liberal wing of the Quakers took out papers in 1864 and dedicated the College to education "under the care of Friends." From its original state as a closely guided Quaker community, the College evolved between 1890 and 1920 into a more worldly center of student life. In came the glee club, the fraternity, and the imposing football schedule in which a small school plays before large crowds and tries to win moral victories by not losing too badly to university giants. The College also developed a substantial physical plant, expanded its faculty gradually, and kept itself firmly based on the Quaker community even as it became ever more like other colleges. The College that Aydelotte inherited was not moribund; it was, he thought, a place with the resources and climate necessary for the reforms he had in mind.

Again, a main avenue of change and embodiment was a distinctive curriculum. The cutting edge and symbol of the leap forward at Swarthmore

in the twenties was the Honors Program, a modified Oxford scheme in which some students were put on a special track of intensive seminars in their junior and senior years. Aydelotte plugged honors work so hard, in speeches and papers, that for a brief period Swarthmore virtually captured the Honors concept. Decades later, in the 1950s, as honors programs became popular, Swarthmore was viewed as the honors pioneer.

But the Honors Program for which the College is so well known was just one among many interlocking changes introduced in the College in the twenties. A change in character was the sum of moves on different fronts. The new President recruited students nationally or open scholarships, searching out bright, serious students with an apparent capacity for leadership. The president, the faculty and their growing band of allies among the students gradually but drastically modified social activities: eliminating freshman hazing, cutting down the number of dances, and, in 1933, abolishing sororities. Most important, the administration and faculty bought back control over athletics from alumni and students by shifting the support of sports from gate receipts to college subsidy, and over a period of about twelve years transformed the program of bigtime sports into one of intramural and low-key intercollegiate sports for the amateur. Athletics and social life were robbed of the dynamics that ordinarily push them toward independence and dominance, and the extracurricular was subordinated to and integrated with the life of serious study that was being moved front and center. Intellectuality became a virtue in the student culture, with much of the excitement of competitive sports transformed to the winning of academic honor.

As in the case of Morgan at Antioch, Aydelotte were very effective in building image, and as the reputation of the college spread, the academic capacity of applicants rose. That reputation increasingly contained a picture of a friendly and lively student body, and students that were independent and non-conforming as well as very bright came to place it high in their college choices. The College then became an overlay in part for such "progressive" or "experimental" colleges as Reed, Antioch and Sarah Lawrence, while remaining for others an alternative chiefly to Harvard, Princeton, Amherst, Oberlin. The College became a very good place to go, intellectually respectable and sufficiently desirable socially to obtain sons and daughters of top government and business leaders, without at the same time being weighed down with the problems of status and cool sophistication that has bedeviled many other leading private colleges of the Eastern Seaboard.

The faculty was steadily expanded from forty in 1920 to one hundred in 1940 and improved markedly in quality until it was a group that could compete effectively in scholarship with university faculties. By the time Aydelotte left in 1940, four-fifths of the faculty had been recruited during his tenure. This faculty was dedicated to the Honors program and the components of the campus that interlocked around it. For them, by 1940, to say Swarthmore was to say Honors Program. And this faculty too, as at Antioch and Reed, came to possess much authority, and the authority they have possessed has been used to conserve the change. This authority resides partly in the department and partly in a sense-of-the-meeting relation of faculty and administration in which some men

of the faculty are more sensed than others.

Swarthmore, like Reed, has features that we would ordinarily associate with graduate schools. The honors students are completely in seminars and self-study for two years. The faculty has favored concentration over scatteration, and there is much specialization in major. The honors students face written and oral examinations at the end of their senior year over extended materials. These examinations are given by outside examiners and are often at the level of master's degree work in institutions where the students are not so bright. The modern trend of undergraduates proceeding to graduate school is very strong at such a college. Along with so many other small colleges, Swarthmore faces the problem of what does it mean to be a liberal arts college in the new age where an unusually able group of students prepare themselves along specialized lines for graduate study.

COMPONENTS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTER OF COLLEGES

These cases exhibit a number of features important to the character of a college: curricular patterns, faculty values, the distribution of authority, public images, student traditions. There is no definitive way to sort such features; we cannot predict that certain features are everywhere important; and we must be careful in reasoning from small colleges to large universities. But the features can be listed and grouped as sensitizing ideas to form a diagnostic battery from which we may draw leads in other cases. As we build up the catalog over time, we become more sensitive to the possibilities of any given case.

I will review these features of college organization under three headings: the institutional; the faculty; and the students.

INSTITUTIONAL FEATURES

The Curriculum: It has become fashionable in research on colleges to ignore the curriculum. But the curriculum is a structure of work assignments of central personnel and tells us much about basic commitments. We can quickly learn, for example, whether a "liberal arts college" is devoted to the traditional disciplines of the liberal arts or to job training, by identifying its variety of courses and majors and the numbers of faculty and students in the different fields. If a college has distinctive educational ideals, we will find them embodied in some form in the curriculum. In the case of Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore, parts of the curriculum constitute a prime element of character. At Antioch, the work-study curriculum is a central commitment, a hallowed part of the institutional self. At Reed, a particular array of mandatory courses and other requirements for graduation, concretely expresses academic toughness in the pure liberal arts. At Swarthmore, Honors is the defining element and symbol. Other colleges may have less distinct curricula , but everywhere the curriculum reflects some of what the institution is committed to doing. The official program is thus an easy place to begin character analysis; perhaps nothing else lies so much on the surface and is so available to the first glance.

Traditional Self-Image. A college is more than a sum of its individual members because, among other reasons, it has a history, and a host of ways, including shared memories, of reflecting that past in the present.

For reasons only partly clear (competitive position in the market is one such reason), colleges are prone to a remembrance of things past and a symbolism of unlike-all-others. The more distinctive the history, the more intense the memory and the symbolism. Antioch is an excellent example. Memory of a heroic age, the 1920s and 1930s, has been carried in the self-identity and mutual identification of senior faculty and administrators. For them, the word Antioch sets up vibrations of the intensity that many Harvard men associate with the word Harvard. It is Morgan, and Community Government, and not firing anyone in the depression, and paying off the mortgage, and the fire in the Science Building, and folk dancing in Red Square, and Personnel Counselors, and always the ceaseless exchange of on-campus and off-campus students in the Coop Program. There is so much that is symbol of the meaning and potency of living one's years at the College and of the College's years in society. In colleges where there is less to symbolize, some kind of unified self-image is still likely to obtain, a slimmed-down version of the past that we might call a memory culture. There are no definite areas of campus life where the core of this culture has to manifest itself. It is often expressed in the themes of the catalogues and commencements, the repetitive cries of students and faculty about the decline of what the college has always stood for, and the issues raised by Young Turks that bring the senior faculty out of their seats.

Authority Structure. The distribution of authority on a campus is so often a critical component because it helps determine what values will be strongly supported and expressed. Different interest groups within the college attempt to further different programs, to serve different constituencies, and to maintain or change traditional self-images. The capacity of the different factions to further group desires is a function of differential authority. The different desires may sometimes be readily identified by opinion surveys and interview, but the differential capacity to implement desire is often sufficiently complex and hidden that much on-campus investigation and historical study is required.

Campuses are bewildering governments because trustee authority, administrative authority, faculty authority, and sometimes student authority, are legitimate principles of authority and operatively in serious contention. Formally the campus may approach a dual or triple government. With authority much subdivided by sub-college, division, department, and administrative office, the large campus also formally has features of a federation. The diffusion of formal authority demands much unofficial or informal behavior on the part of field officers trying to fulfill their own responsibilities as well as by officers trying to coordinate the whole. The modern university more than any other modern organization presses important actors toward unofficial interaction, adaptation, and accommodation. We should assume that many of these actors are following the dictum: "there's always a way around the rule - find it." One specific way to study the dynamics of change,

then, is to identify some successful campus leaders and find out how they unofficially have worked their way through ambiguity or around rules to institute a change that is later ratified as part of the formal structure. This kind of research is perhaps a search for the latent pilot project.

Social Base. There are certain features of the character of colleges that are often overlooked because they reside off campus. Public image is ordinarily very important, yet is rarely discussed. The impressions of the college held by outsiders mediate the college's relations with its environment and affect its viability. The social bases or constituencies of the college are also important, for resources must be drawn from the environment and resource-granting groups must be constructed and institutionalized if the organization is to achieve some security. With their turnover of clientele (students), colleges seek constituencies that will guarantee a steady flow of students. Financial supporters, of course, are also sought. These external linkages may actually free a college, making it quite autonomous; or they may entail dependencies that determine policy and practice.

To ascertain what a college can and cannot do, therefore, we must usually identify these "in-the-environment" components of character - how the college is regarded and by whom, the social strata from which students flow, and the nature of the relation to financial donors and host agencies. The important external relations also increasingly include a connection to the Federal Government. The term

"federal-grant university" has recently come into use to refer to the university that receives a sizeable share of its resources from the Federal Government. Much has been entailed in this relation: e.g., heavy support for natural science and with this a change in the balance of the curriculum and in the balance of faculty rewards; conflict among segments of the faculty; more emphasis on research; a diversification of revenue sources that has given public universities greater freedom from constraints of local and state government; the growth of direct ties between faculty entrepreneurs and outside agencies, weakening collective controls of faculty and administration.

THE FACULTY

Certain aspects of the faculty has been discussed in the three case descriptions and under institutional features above; e.g., the frequent linkage of faculty values to the traditional self-image of the institution; the frequent further linkage of faculty authority to the traditional values and self-image. The different conceptions of the institution held by faculty members and the capacity to defend and sustain certain values are critical faculty components of institutional character.

We can expect certain general orientations to vary systematically among colleges, according to the class of colleges to which the institution belongs. In order to perform effectively, a college needs diverse orientations in its faculty: these include teaching, administration, and research and scholarly study. Colleges vary greatly in the extent

to which they reward these different orientations, and in the orientations' distribution and relative strength, with four-year colleges largely rewarding attention to the student and universities rewarding orientation to one's discipline or profession. The kind of professor idealized in the small liberal arts college may be the teacher-scholar, the teacher-counselor-friend, or just plain teacher, but in any case the norm emphasizes teaching and points to the student; in these colleges, the undergraduate is what the college is largely about. But the university is involved in many other operations, being primarily a center of research, scholarship, and professional training; close attention to the education of the individual undergraduate student is not generally a prominent part of the professor model as it is seen from within the ranks.

Thus faculty members' interests vary from a singleness of purpose in shaping the undergraduate student to a complex of interests in which the student plays a small part. At one extreme there is the teacher who deeply involves himself in the lives of students, seeing them frequently and informally in diverse situations and being on call at any hour for advice and support. For such locally oriented teachers, "their" college is a way of life for their families as well as for themselves. Here faculty interests encourage an interpenetration of faculty and student cultures. At the other extreme is the professor who teaches as little as possible and then is off to interests that separate him from students, often but not always the pursuit of research and scholarly writing. These research and scholarly interests, reflecting an

orientation to the cosmopolitan world of scholarship, science and distant peers, and a career pattern of movement from college to college, tend to reduce faculty-student relations to interaction in the classroom. Cosmopolitan interests are an important source of the schism between faculty and student cultures that is a central component of the character of many state universities. In pulling the teachers away from the students, the faculty's professional interests promote the rise and persistence of an autonomous student culture which is filled in by student interests and definitions of the campus situation.

In the strain between professionalism and localism in faculty interests, between an orientation to a far-flung discipline and a commitment to the local college and student, some faculty members effect a compromise wherein they have many avenues of contact with students while sustaining a professionally rewarding career. A few such men are found in the better small colleges, and are afforded high status because they are both professionally competent and locally committed. They are also found in the large universities, where they rarely receive the highest esteem for their involvement with undergraduates. In general, however, most faculty members do not balance these interests in a rough parity, but come down heavily on the interests rewarded by the organization and promising for a career. Thus, small-college faculties tend to be strongholds of personal and particularistic relations with students; university staffs, centers of impersonal relations and universalistic criteria. The one generally produces some faculty understanding and penetration of student life; the other is based on and reinforces social distance between faculty and students.

THE STUDENTS

There is nothing in other organizations that is quite like the student in the college. He is clientele, materiel, and participant, all rolled into one; and he is considerably freer than the hospital patient, the prison inmate, and "cl nts" of most other people-processing organizations to whom he otherwise has important similarities. His characteristics are institution-defining and in his relative freedom he maneuvers significantly in interaction with staff. Hence we need always to know, at a minimum, the students' input qualities and their campus roles and subcultures.

Input Qualities. The freshmen classes of different colleges vary immensely in their occupational aspirations, educational plans, personality characteristics (e.g., creativity, authoritarianism), and a wide range of attitudes and values, as well as in the ability and achievement that are measured by standard tests. The imput qualities enter heavily into the determination of the character of the institution. A large number of entering students interested in social reform and political action will tend to produce á campus subculture of social reform and political action. A large number of boys coming to a college for job training in engineering will tend to produce a no-nonsense vocational spirit on campus.

In understanding the character of a college or university, it helps to know not only what the students' input qualities specifically are and what effect these characteristics have on student life and the tasks of faculty and administrators but also how come the freshmen class

(and transfers) take the shape they do. The input qualities are determined by such characteristics of the college as location, tuition, and formal selectivity; and, as mentioned earlier, by reputation - a carrying mechanism of character. Some input is accidental, e.g., by blind or unthinking choice, but most is systematically linked to what the institution already is and is thought to be. We fully relate the freshman class as a component of character to other components of institutional character only when we know why people with certain characteristics came and people with certain other characteristics stayed away.

Roles and Subcultures. Growing up in college, or getting through college, has many shapes. Students do it differently because of different original intention or because of styles they encounter on campus. There is much to learn on a campus about the variety of student interests, roles, and subcultures. First, we need to know the range of alternatives. Is the campus a single culture for students, or two or three, or a dozen? Some small colleges approach the monolithic extreme; some large universities approach the heterogeneity of the metropolis--name an orientation and you can find it present, from John Birch Society to Communist Party, from fundamental sect to atheism, from the most crude vocationalism to the most precious scholarship. In identifying the range of alternative cultural homes, we come to know the contents of the subcultures and something about their relative strength in numbers of students involved.

Second, we need to know whether an "orientation" is a "subculture"; that is, whether a particular sentiment is held by detached individuals who pass one another as strangers or is a set of definitions and responses shared by individuals who connect. An atomistic orientation may be held by many students but be weak in influence on campus because it does not enlist the energies of action cliques and their supporting groups. Students who commute to college for job-training do not generally underpin their orientation with group ties and interpersonal supports in the same degree as do the nonconformists who cling together in the pad and coffee-house. The first group, we often say, is the passive majority; the latter group has visibility and influence "out of proportion to their numbers."

In studying student subcultures, it is often helpful to identify how the "extracurricular" components of the life of the student connect to the "curricular" components. Are the two tightly or loosely integrated; what are the terms of existence that one sets for the other; does one dominate the other; how does the administrative structure of the campus and the interests of the faculty determine the relation of the curricular and extracurricular?

THE IMPORTANCE OF HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

To interpret organization character from organizational behavior is difficult any way that we attempt it. Similar events or practices have different meaning in different organizations, and indeed can have different meaning in one organization at different stages of development. We find ourselves unsure whether an observed practice is a

central or marginal component, a part of basic commitments or an accidental and expendable appendage. Much that we wish to know, e.g., the institutional self-image, is an "intangible" composite that is amorphous to the structuring eye and distant to the intimate touch. Given such apparent difficulties, how then best to proceed in appraising the character of a particular institution? One way, especially where we are interested in change, is to cultivate a historical sensitivity. An organizational analysis with historical perspective offers a number of advantages that I tried to exemplify in the case descriptions of three colleges. I will offer several guides for this style of analysis and suggest a few of the advantages.

The first directive is to search for the last character-defining era, the most recent period of major change, and identify the ideals and new practices of that time. Study of the critical era offers many possibilities of insight. One can study the specific tools of change at that stage of history and the conditions under which a major change was possible. One can study elements of later importance at a time when struggle and definition were necessary, when the elements were new and problematic and requiring deliberate effort to establish them. To study the period of transformation is usually to study certain features of present character in their most explicit and pristine form, before they became partially obscured by routines and made confusing to the eyes of the current observer by compromise and evolution. As Herbert Kaufman has observed, in a brilliant organizational study: "the members

of all organizations are governed by values, beliefs, and customs that are almost indiscernible if research is confined to short periods in the evolution of the organizations. Time is a factor to be reckoned with." [2]

The second directive is to identify the carrying mechanisms, the features of organization that have the dynamic capacity to sustain not only themselves but other elements as well and have worked to preserve character from the last period of major change to the present. A common carrying mechanism is the relatively small group of senior faculty who (a) are wedded to a particular conception, (b) recruit and socialize to their point of view, and (c) have sufficient authority to ward off intruders and innovators. Such a cadre or core group is a dynamic element in that it is a self-renewing source of energy and commitment, often spontaneously and unconsciously working to maintain a certain set of values. Another common carrying mechanism is public reputation, fixed in patterned ways in the minds of outsiders, mediating the relation of the college to many aspects of its environment. Its dynamic role comes in its effects on the availability of new students, faculty, administrators, money and moral support.

Many structures and practices of a campus, e.g., an esteemed segment of the curriculum, have some momentum of their own, and, where interlocked with other features, are capable of carrying the past into the present and future. Many features of a campus contribute to some degree, and respective contributions are difficult to disentangle and weigh.

Having studied the last character-defining era and the mechanisms of stable trajectory, a third step is to look for the pressures of current changing environment on established character and the adaptations thereby required. We are all aware that small liberal arts colleges, in general, are facing a major test currently, as technology, specialization, and mass education come to dominate higher education. But the colleges face the test in significantly different degree and in different specific ways according to the propensities of their own specific character. Antioch, with its commitment to a fairly extreme version of general education, finds itself under much pressure, from new student and new faculty, to reduce its work program, cut back on the effort to make a community, and concentrate on the specialized classroom that prepares the student for graduate school. The current evolution of programs is in these directions. Reed does not face the same problems in adapting to this age of specialization. It always has been classroom-centered and specialized; its problems center on how far a commitment to research should be developed in the faculty, to compete for scarce faculty talent, and how much to venture into becoming a graduate school. These somewhat different sets of problems and responses can only be understood by knowing well what the College has traditionally stood for as well as knowing the pressures of modern times on the American liberal arts college.

In short, we gain insight on the character of a college and its propensity for change by inquiring into the last major stage of character definition, the elements that have perpetuated that character over

time, and the adjustment of those elements to a changing environment. The trajectory of historic character allows us to make some prediction of what the organization would be like in the future "if left alone." If we also identify current environmental pressures, we can then predict how that trajectory will be buffeted and in what direction it will probably swerve.

FOOTNOTES

1 This research has been a part of the Study of Selected Institutions, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. Supported by the Carnegie Corporation, the Study began in 1958 and will be reported in two volumes under preparation and scheduled to be published in late 1966 or early 1967.

2 Herbert Kaufman, The Forest Ranger: A Study in Administrative Behavior. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1960, p. 6.